THE HONOURABLE SHRI JUSTICE A. GOPAL REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO.27305 OF 1996

DATE: 28.2.2007

Between:

Palamoori Contract Labour Union,
Venkateswara Colony, Mahaboobnagar,
represented by its President
P. Narayanaswamy. .... Petitioner.

And

The Government of India, rerpeswenceted
By its Secetary, Labour Department
(Bonded Labour), New Delhi and others. ....
Respondents.

ORDER

ORAL ORDER:

The petitioner, a registered organization established with the avowed object of ventilating the cause of poor labourers who had migrated from the District of Mahabubnagar to various parts of the country, filed the present writ petition for issuing necessary directions to the Government of India for issuing necessary instructions to respondents 2 to 9 for extending cooperation, assistance to the petitioner-organization for investigation, enquiry and reporting about the bonded labourers of Mahabubnagar District working in the states of respondents 2 to 9.

While admitting the writ petition, this Court by order dated 27.1.1997 directed respondents 2 to 9 to extend cooperation and assistance to the petitioner organization for investigation, enquiry and reporting about the bonded labour of Mahabbubnagar District working in the respective states.

Pursuant to the interim directions, the State of Gujarat filed an affidavit in reply on behalf of the State of Gujarat denying the petition allegations and stating that there are no bonded labourers working in the State of Gujarat migrated from Mahabubnagar District and, therefore, there is no question of sending back such persons from the State of Gujarat and in the absence of any specific

averments, it would be difficult for them to answer the vague allegations made by the petitioner-organization.

Since no reply has been filed controverting the allegations of the petitioners and since no particulars of the persons who are said to be working in the States of respondents 2 to 9 on migration from Mahabubnagar District as bonded labourers are mentioned, the relief prayed for cannot be granted. It may also be noted that the writ petition as against respondents 4 to 7 has already been dismissed by this Court for default by orders dated 14.2.2003.

In view of the above, the Writ Petition against the remaining respondents is also liable to be dismissed. The Writ Petition is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

_____

28th February, 2007 **A. GOPAL REDDY, J**

vtv